Atty Dkt No. LEAR 03771 PUS / 03771

S/N: 10/692,955

Reply to Office Action of October 8, 2004

Remarks

In response to the non-final Office Action mailed October 8, 2004, the

Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections and that the case pass to issue

in light of the amendments above and the remarks below. By this paper, claims 1-5, 8, 10 and

14-19 are amended, claim 21 is new, and no claims are canceled. As such, claims 1-21 are

pending.

The Examiner has set forth the following rejections: (1) claims 14-19 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; (2) claims 1, 6, 7, 9 and 10 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,706,810 to Petrilli

(hereinafter the Petrilli patent); (3) claims 11-14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

as being unpatentable over the Petrilli patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,148,282 to

Sedighzadeh (hereinafter the Sedighzadeh patent); (4) claims 15-17 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Petrilli patent in view of the Sedighzadeh and

further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,644,512 to Grilk (hereinafter the Grilk patent); and (5)

claims 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Petrilli

patent in view of the Sedighzadeh patent and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,624,114 to

Soleau (hereinafter the Soleau patent).

The Examiner has allowed claims 2-5 and 8. The Applicants kindly thank the

Examiner for allowance of these claims.

**Rejection of Claims 14-19 Under** 

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments obviate these

rejections to claims 14-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

-6-

## Rejection of Claims 1, 6, 7, 9 and 10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Over the Petrilli Patent

The Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections to claims 1, 6, 7, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are obviated in light of the above amendments. In particular, independent claim 1 is amended by this paper to include the limitations in allowed claim 2. Thereby, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 6, 7, 9 and 10, which depend therefrom and include all of the limitations thereof, are patentable and nonobvious over the references cited by the Examiner.

## Rejection of Claims 11-14 and 20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) In View of the Petrilli and Sedighzadeh Patents

Independent claim 11 and dependent claims 12-14 and 20, which depend therefrom, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Petrilli patent in view of the Sedighzadeh patent.

Independent claim 11 claims, in part, a secondary panel comprising a one-way light transmissible material that covers a display such that the display is only visible through the one-way light transmissible material when the display is active and it is concealed behind the one-way light transmissible material when the display is inactive. The Examiner admits that the Petrilli patent fails to disclose the foregoing limitation and attempts to make up for this deficiency with reliance on the Sedighzadeh patent. In particular, the Examiner is relying on the Sedighzadeh patent to teach that it would be obvious to include a one-way light transmissible material with the Petrilli patent.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has improperly relied upon the Sedighzadeh patent. In particular, the Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine the Petrilli and Sedighzadeh patents in the absence of improper hindsight reasoning derived from the Applicants' application. As described in more detail

Atty Dkt No. LEAR 03771 PUS / 03771

S/N: 10/692,955

Reply to Office Action of October 8, 2004

below, the Petrilli patent teaches away from incorporating the one-way light transmissible

material disclosed in the Sedighzadeh patent.

The Petrilli patent teaches the following:

The preferred embodiment provides one or more plexiglass windows carried by the liner which are movable

between an open position to provide access to the equipment

within the console and a closed position to protect the equipment

from water or the like while <u>permitting instrument displays to</u> be viewed and monitored. (Column 2, lines 39-45, empahsis

added)

As shown above, the Petrilli patent teaches and requires a clear plexiglass

window so that devices behind the window may be viewed. This teaches away from the

Examiner incorporating the one-way light transmissible material of the Sedighzadeh patent into

the Petrilli patent as to do so prevents viewing the devices stored behind the window, as

required by the express teachings of the Petrilli patent. Accordingly, the Examiner has

improperly relied on the combination of the Petrilli and Sedighzadeh patents in rejecting claims

11-14 and 20. Consequently, these claims are patentable and nonobvious over the cited

references.

Rejection of Claims 15-17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Over The Petrilli, Sedighzadeh and Grilk Patents

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 15-17, which depend from

patentable independent claim 11, are patentable and nonobvious over the cited references for

at least the same reasons that the independent claims from which they depend are patentable.

-8-

Atty Dkt No. LEAR 03771 PUS / 03771

S/N: 10/692,955

Reply to Office Action of October 8, 2004

Rejection of Claims 18 and 19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Over the Petrilli, Sedighzadeh, and Soleau Patents

The Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 18 and 19, which

depend from patentable independent claim 11, are patentable for at least the same reasons as

the independent claim from which they depend are patentable.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that each rejection

has been fully replied to and traversed and that the case is in condition to pass to issue. A

check in the amount of \$88.00 is enclosed to cover the fees associated with new independent

claim 21. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issue. The Examiner is

invited to contact the undersigned if it would further prosecution of this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. Fowler et al.

John R. Buser

Reg. No. 51,517

Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: 10-25-04

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: 248-358-4400

Fax: 248-358-3351

-9-